arXiv:1005.3159v1 [math.RA] 18 May 2010

THE MATRIX EQUATION $XA-AX=f(X)$

GERALD BOURGEOIS

Abstract. Let f be an analytic function defined on a complex domain Ω and $A\in\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. We assume that there exists a unique α satisfying $f(\alpha)=0$. When $f'(\alpha)=0$ and A is non derogatory, we solve completely the equation $XA-AX=f(X)$. This generalizes Burde's results. When $f'(\alpha)\neq 0$, we give a method to completely solve the equation $XA-AX=f(X)$. Solutions of the equation $f(XA-AX)=X$ are also given in particular cases.

1. Introduction

Let $n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. In [1], Burde solved completely the matrix equation $XA-AX=X^p$, with $p\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, unknown $X\in\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and A a given $(n\times n)$ non derogatory complex matrix. In this article, we propose to extend Burde's results to a more general class of matrix equations. We introduce notations that will be used in the sequel of the article.

Notations.

1. For any $X\in\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, $\sigma(X)$ denotes the spectrum of X.
2. Denote by I_n the identity matrix of $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$.

Let Ω be a complex domain and $f:\Omega\rightarrow\mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function. We consider the matrix equation

$$XA-AX=f(X) \tag{1}$$

where the $(n\times n)$ complex matrix A is given and the unknown is a $(n\times n)$ complex matrix X such that $\sigma(X)\subset\Omega$. We assume that there exists a unique $\alpha\in\Omega$ such that $f(\alpha)=0$.

When $f'(\alpha)=0$ and A is non derogatory, we solve completely the equation (1). The solution of this problem follows Burde's method.

When $f'(\alpha)\neq 0$ and there exist two eigenvalues of A whose the difference is $f'(\alpha)$, then we prove that Equation (1) admits non trivial solutions. Moreover, we give a method to completely solve Equation (1), although the involved computations are complicated in the most general possible setting. Thus we study the equation

$$XA-AX=\log(X).$$

Now it should be noted that the method used to prove these results differs from Burde's one.

We have a look at the equation $f(XA-AX)=X$ when f is locally invertible in a neighborhood of 0. In particular we show that the equations $XA-AX=\log(X)$ and $e^{XA-AX}=X$ have same solutions. Further results on the equation

$$f(XA-AX)=X$$

are also given in the case where f is not locally invertible in any neighborhood of 0.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 15A24.

Key words and phrases. Matrix equation, Lie algebra.

2. General remarks

Recall the

Definitions.

1. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. The matrices A, B are said *simultaneously triangularizable* if there exists an invertible matrix $P \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that $P^{-1}AP$ and $P^{-1}BP$ are upper triangular.
2. [2] Let $X \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be such that $\sigma(X) \subset \Omega$. We put
$$f(X) = \frac{1}{2i\pi}\int_\Gamma f(z)(zI_n - X)^{-1}dz,$$
where Γ is a counterclockwise oriented closed contour in Ω which encloses $\sigma(X)$.
3. [2] The matrix $f(X)$ is said to be a *primary matrix function.*

Remark. *The matrix $f(X)$ does not depend on the choice of the contour Γ.*

We have the following well-known

Proposition 1. *(1) The matrix $f(X)$ can be written as a polynomial in X whose coefficients depend on X.*
(2) We have the equality: $\sigma(f(X)) = f(\sigma(X))$.

Proof. see [2]. ☐

Theorem 1. *Let $A, X \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be such that $XA - AX = f(X)$. The matrices A and X are simultaneously triangularizable and $\sigma(X) \subset f^{-1}(0)$.*

Proof. Let V be the vector space spanned by $\{A, I_n, X, \cdots, X^{n-1}\}$. One checks easily by induction that:

$$\text{for all } i \geq 1,\ \ X^iA - AX^i = iX^{i-1}f(X). \tag{2}$$

By Cayley-Hamilton Theorem and Proposition 1, $X^iA - AX^i$ belongs to V, and V is a Lie algebra. The derived series of V is

$$V_1 = [V, V] \subset \mathbb{C}[X],\ V_2 = [V_1, V_1] = \{0\}.$$

Thus V is solvable. According to Lie Theorem, V is triangularizable, that is A and X are simultaneously triangularizable. Therefore, $XA - AX$ is a nilpotent matrix and $f(\sigma(X)) = \{0\}$ (see Proposition 1). ☐

Definition. *Let $M = [m_{ij}]$ be a strictly upper triangular $(n \times n)$ matrix. For every $i \in \{1, \cdots, n-1\}$ the set $\{m_{1,i+1}, \cdots, m_{n-i,n}\}$ is said to be the* false diagonal of M with index i.

Theorem 2. *Assume that there exists a unique $\alpha \in \Omega$ such that $f(\alpha) = 0$. The equation (1) admits a solution X such that $X \neq \alpha I_n$ if and only if there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \sigma(A)$ such that $\lambda - \mu = f'(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a solution of Equation (1). According to Theorem 1, $\sigma(X) = \{\alpha\}$ and $X = \alpha I_n + N$ where N is a nilpotent matrix. Replacing X by $\alpha I_n + N$ in Equation (1), one obtains the following equivalences

$$X \text{ is solution of Equation (1)} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad NA - AN = f(\alpha I_n + N)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \quad NA - AN = f'(\alpha)N + \cdots + \frac{f^{(n-1)}(\alpha)}{(n-1)!}N^{n-1}. \tag{3}$$

Let N be a nilpotent matrix satisfying Equality (3). Now we prove that N is different of 0 if and only if there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \sigma(A)$ such that $\lambda - \mu = f'(\alpha)$.

($\Leftarrow$): We may assume that $A = [a_{ij}]$ is a upper triangular matrix such that $a_{11} = \mu$ and $a_{nn} = \lambda$. Let $N = \begin{pmatrix} & 1 \\ \boxed{\quad 0 \quad} & \end{pmatrix}$. Since $N^2 = 0$, one has

$$NA - AN = f'(\alpha)N = f(\alpha I_n + N).$$

($\Rightarrow$): We may assume that A and N are upper triangular matrices such that $N \neq 0$ and, for every i, $a_{ii} = \lambda_i$. Suppose that

$$\text{for all } i \neq j, \quad \lambda_i - \lambda_j \neq f'(\alpha). \tag{4}$$

By considering the nonzero false diagonal of N with minimal index k, Equation (3) gives the following relations:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} n_{1,1+k}(\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_1 - f'(\alpha)) & = & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ n_{n-k,n}(\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-k} - f'(\alpha)) & = & 0. \end{array}$$

According to Inequality (4), the false diagonal of index k is zero. That is a contradiction. ☐

3. The case $f'(\alpha) = 0$

Now, we assume that there exists a unique $\alpha \in \Omega$ such that $f(\alpha) = 0$ and $f'(\alpha) = 0$. Then we look for the non-zero nilpotent solutions of the equation:

$$XA - AX = X^p g(X) \tag{5}$$

where $p \in \{2, \cdots, n-1\}$ and g is a polynomial depending on f only, such that $g(0) \neq 0$ and $\deg(g) < n - p$. Relation (2) can be rewritten as

$$\text{for all } \ i \geq 1, \ \ X^i A - AX^i = iX^{i+p-1}g(X). \tag{6}$$

Remarks. *i) According to Theorem 2, necessarily A has multiple eigenvalues.*
ii) The case $p = n$ reduces to find the nilpotent matrices that commute with A.

Definition. *Let $h(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i X^i$ be a non zero polynomial. The valuation of h is $val(h) = \min\{i \mid a_i \neq 0\}$.*

Lemma 1. *Let $s, l \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The following equality holds:*

$$A^s X^l = \sum_{j=0}^{s} h_j(X) A^{s-j} \tag{7}$$

where, for every $0 \leq j \leq s$, h_j is a polynomial such that $val(h_j) \geq l + j(p-1)$.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on s. The case $s = 1$ is obvious. Relation (7) implies that

$$A^{s+1}X^l = \sum_{j=0}^{s} A h_j(X) A^{s-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{s} AX^{l+j(p-1)}\phi(X)A^{s-j},$$

where ϕ is a polynomial. For every $l, j \in \mathbb{N}, j \leq s$, the following equality holds:

$AX^{l+j(p-1)}\phi(X)A^{s-j} = [X^{l+j(p-1)}A - (l + j(p-1))X^{l+(j+1)(p-1)}g(X)]\phi(X)A^{s-j}.$

Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$. From the equalities:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} X^{l+j(p-1)}AX^q A^{s-j} & = & X^{l+j(p-1)}(X^q A - qX^{q+p-1}g(X))A^{s-j} \\ & = & X^{l+j(p-1)+q}A^{(s+1)-j} - qX^{l+(j+1)(p-1)+q}g(X)A^{(s+1)-(j+1)}, \end{array}$$

one deduces that

$$AX^{l+j(p-1)}\phi(X)A^{s-j}=\sum_{j=0}^{s+1}g_j(X)A^{s+1-j},$$

where the $g_j's$ are polynomial satisfying $val(g_j)\geq l+j(p-1)$. ☐

Lemma 2. *Assume that the matrices A and X satisfy Equation (5) and that X is a nilpotent matrix. Let $v\in\mathbb{C}^n$ and $m\in\mathbb{N}^*$ such that $A^mv=0$, r,k be integers such that $r\geq n$ and $1\leq k<\dfrac{r}{p-1}$. For every $t\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $t\geq r-k(p-1)$, one has $A^{m+k-1}X^tv=0$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on k. Clearly $AX^t-X^tA=-tX^{t+p-1}g(X)=0$. Thus, A and X^t commute and $A^mX^tv=X^tA^mv=0$. This proves the case $k=1$. We assume that the lemma is true for $k-1$. Let $t\geq r-k(p-1)$. We show that

$$A^{m+k-1}X^tv=A^{m+k-2}X^tAv-tA^{m+k-2}X^{t+p-1}g(X)v=0.$$

Since $t+p-1\geq r-(k-1)(p-1)$, one has

$$A^{m+k-2}X^{t+p-1}g(X)v=0.$$

By Lemma 1, we can write

$$A^{m+k-2}X^tAv=\sum_{j=0}^{m+k-2}h_j(X)A^{m+k-j-1}v,$$

with for every $j\in[\![0,m+k-2]\!]$, $val(h_j)\geq t+j(p-1)$.
For every $j>k$ one has

$$val(h_j)\geq t+j(p-1)\geq t+k(p-1)\geq r\geq n.$$

Hence, for all $j>k$, one has $h_j(X)=0$. Obviously, if $j\leq k$ one has $A^{m+k-j-1}v=0$. This proves the lemma. ☐

Theorem 3. *Assume that the matrix X satisfies Equation (5) and that X is a nilpotent matrix. Then the generalized eigenspaces of A are X-invariant.*

Proof. Let λ be an eigenvalue of A and let $H_\lambda=ker(A-\lambda I_n)^n$ be the generalized eigenspace associated to λ. We may assume $\lambda=0$. For every $v\in H_0$, there exists an integer m such that $A^mv=0$. Let $k\in\mathbb{N}^*$ such that $r=1+k(p-1)\geq n$. Applying Lemma 2, with $k=\dfrac{r-1}{p-1}$ and $t=1$, we obtain $A^{m+k-1}Xv=0$, that is $Xv\in H_0$. ☐

The generalized eigenspaces of A span $\mathbb{C}^n$ and thus we can deduce easily the following

Corollary 1. *Let $\sigma(A)=\{\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k\}$ and P be an invertible matrix such that*

$$P^{-1}AP=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{k}(\lambda_iI_{\alpha_i}+N_i),$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^k\alpha_i=n$ and, for all i, N_i is a $(\alpha_i\times\alpha_i)$ nilpotent matrix.

If X is a nilpotent matrix solution of Equation (5), then $P^{-1}XP=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{k}X_i$, where for every i, X_i is a nilpotent matrix that satisfies $X_iN_i-N_iX_i=X_i^pg(X_i)$.

4. The case $f'(\alpha) = 0$ and A non derogatory

Definition. *A complex square matrix M is said to be* non derogatory *if for all $\lambda \in \sigma(M)$, the number of Jordan blocks of M associated with λ is 1.*

We assume A is non derogatory and we consider Equation (5). According to Corollary 1, it is enough to solve the equation:

$$XJ_n - J_nX = X^p g(X), \tag{8}$$

where J_n is the nilpotent Jordan block of dimension n and X is a unknown nilpotent matrix.

4.1. The case where A is a Jordan block.

Lemma 3. *Let X be a nilpotent matrix that is solution of Equation (8) and let $(e_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then $Xe_1 = 0$.*

Proof. • We show that for $l \geq p$, $X^l e_1 = 0$ implies $X^{l-(p-1)}e_1 = 0$. Indeed, one has

$$J_nX^{l-(p-1)} - X^{l-(p-1)}J_n = -(l-(p-1))X^l g(X).$$

Thus we deduce that $J_nX^{l-(p-1)}e_1 = 0$. Therefore, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $X^{l-(p-1)}e_1 = \lambda e_1$. Since X is nilpotent, $\lambda = 0$.
• Obviously, $X^n e_1 = 0$. By repeating the previous argument, there exists $k \leq p$ such that $X^k e_1 = 0$. Thus $X^p e_1 = 0$ and $Xe_1 = 0$. ☐

Lemma 4. *Every nilpotent solution of Equation (8) is strictly upper triangular.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. The result is obvious for $n = 1$. Let X be a nilpotent solution of Equation (8). According to Lemma 3, $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ 0 & X_1 \end{pmatrix}$ where X_1 is a $(n-1 \times n-1)$ matrix. Clearly, X_1 is nilpotent and satisfies

$$X_1J_{n-1} - J_{n-1}X_1 = X_1^p g(X_1).$$

Thus, X_1 is strictly upper triangular by induction hypothesis. ☐

Theorem 4. *We obtain all nilpotent solutions $X = [x_{ij}]$ of Equation (8) in the following way. Let k be the coefficient of degree two of the polynomial $X^p g(X)$. We choose arbitrarily the last column of X with $x_{n-1,n}$ satisfying:*

$$\text{for all } i \in \{1, \cdots, n-2\},\ \ 1 - ikx_{n-1,n} \neq 0. \tag{9}$$

The other coefficients of the strictly upper triangular matrix X are obtained recursively by solving equations of degree one.

Proof. • The computation of the false diagonal of index 2 in Equation (8) gives:

$$\text{for all } 2 \leq i \leq n-1,\ \ x_{i-1,i}(1 - kx_{i,i+1}) = x_{i,i+1}.$$

If there exists an $i \in [\![2, n-1]\!]$ such that $1 - kx_{i,i+1} = 0$ then Equation (8) admits only the zero solution. Otherwise, one has for all $i \in [\![2, n-1]\!]$:

$$x_{i-1,i} = \frac{x_{i,i+1}}{1 - kx_{i,i+1}}.$$

Hence if Condition (9) is satisfied, then for all $i \in [\![2, n-1]\!]$, one has:

$$x_{i-1,i} = \frac{x_{n-1,n}}{1 - (n-i)kx_{n-1,n}}.$$

• We reason in the same way for the false diagonals of index $3, 4, \cdots, n-2$. Finally, for the last false diagonal, $x_{1,n}$ can be arbitrarily chosen. ☐

Remarks. *(1) Once the last column of X is chosen, the matrix X is uniquely determined.*

(2) The obtained matrix X is similar to J_n if and only if $x_{n-1,n} \neq 0$.

4.2. **Numerical computations.** The performance of computations was measured by using a 2 GHz Intel Core Duo processor provided with 2 GB RAM. One checks easily that the complexity of the calculations is $O(n^2)$. In other hand, the determination of the coefficients of X as a function of the last column, is much more complicated. For instance, for $n = 10$, we consider the equation

$$XJ_{10} - J_{10}X = -7X^2 + 3X^3 - X^4 + X^5 - 2X^6 - X^7 + 3X^8 - 5X^9$$

where X is a nilpotent matrix.
First case: we look for the matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$ as a function of the $(x_{i,10})_{1\leq i\leq 9}$. Using Maple, we obtain for all $i, j \in \{1, \cdots, 9\}$, $x_{ij} = \dfrac{P_{ij}(x_{1,10}, \cdots, x_{9,10})}{Q_{ij}(x_{9,10})}$, where P_{ij}, Q_{ij} are polynomials. The duration of calculation is $12''$ but the display requires more than 2000 Maple lines.
Second case: The $(x_{i,10})_{1\leq i\leq 9}$ are randomly chosen as integers in $[\![-10, 10]\!]$. We obtain the exact values of the $(x_{ij})_{ij}$, as rational fractions, in $0''6$.

4.3. A **is non derogatory.** Thanks to Corollary 1 and Theorem 4, we obtain the

Theorem 5. *Assume that $A = [a_{ij}]$ is non derogatory. All the nilpotent solutions of Equation (5) can be explicitly determined. Moreover a nilpotent solution X of Equation (5) has coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}((a_{ij})_{ij}, (\lambda_i)_{1\leq i\leq k}, (u_{1,\alpha_i}, \cdots, u_{\alpha_i-1,\alpha_i})_{1\leq i\leq k})$ where the $(u_{1,\alpha_i}, \cdots, u_{\alpha_i-1,\alpha_i})_{1\leq i\leq k}$ are chosen as last columns during the calculations of Theorem 4. In particular, the general solution X depends on $n - k$ parameters.*

5. THE CASE $f'(\alpha) \neq 0$

Now we assume that there exists a unique $\alpha \in \Omega$ such that $f(\alpha) = 0$ and that $f'(\alpha) \neq 0$. We study the non zero nilpotent solutions of the equation

$$XA - AX = Xg(X), \tag{10}$$

where g is a polynomial such that $\deg(g) < n - 1$ and $g(0) \neq 0$. Moreover, g depends only on the function f. We may assume $g(0) = 1$. Relation (2) can be rewritten as:

$$\text{for all } i \geq 1,\ \ X^iA - AX^i = iX^ig(X). \tag{11}$$

Remark. *For $g = 1$ we obtain a particular case of the Sylvester equation (see* [2]*)*

$$\phi(X) = XB - CX = D \tag{12}$$

where $B \in \mathcal{M}_q(\mathbb{C})$, $C \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{C})$ and $D \in \mathcal{M}_{pq}(\mathbb{C})$ are given and $X \in \mathcal{M}_{pq}(\mathbb{C})$ is to be determined. Note that

$$\sigma(\phi) = \{\lambda - \mu | \lambda \in \sigma(B), \mu \in \sigma(C)\}. \tag{13}$$

Lemma 5. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then $ker(X^k)$ is A-invariant.*

Proof. Let $u \in ker(X^k)$. The equality

$$X^kA - X^{k-1}AX = X^kg(X)$$

implies that $X^kAu = X^{k-1}AXu$. With Equality (11), we obtain $X^{k-1}AXu = 0$. ☐

5.1. **Decomposition of the solutions.** Let $A \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and X be a nilpotent solution of Equation (10). Let $\lambda \in \sigma(A), u \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $p \in [\![1, n]\!]$ such that $(A - \lambda I_n)^p u = 0$.

Lemma 6. *Let s be a positive integer. One has*

$$Xu \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} ker(A + (i - \lambda)I_n)^p.$$

$$X^s u \in \bigoplus_{i \geq s} ker(A + (i - \lambda)I_n)^p.$$

Proof. We may assume $\lambda = 0$. For any integers r, s, $P_s^{(r)}$ denotes a polynomial in the variable X such that $val(P_s^{(r)}) \geq s$. Since $g(0) = 1$, we have the equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } k \leq n,\ (A + kI_n)X^k &= X^k A + P_{k+1}^{(0)}, \\ \text{for } k < l \leq n,\ (A + kI_n)X^l &= X^l A + P_l^{(0)} \text{ and} \\ (A + kI_n)P_l^{(0)} &= P_l^{(1)} A + P_l^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

- Using equalities (14), we easily see that

$$(A + I_n)^p X u = (XA^p + \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} P_2^{(r)} A^r)u = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} P_2^{(r)} A^r u.$$

By induction on s, we obtain for every $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} (A + sI_n)^p \cdots (A + I_n)^p X u &= (X^s A^p Q(A) + \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} P_{s+1}^{(r)} A^r)u \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} P_{s+1}^{(r)} A^r u, \end{aligned}$$

where Q is a polynomial. Since for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $P_n^{(r)} = 0$, the result follows.

- Assume that $X^s u = \sum_{i \geq s} u_i$, where for every i, $u_i \in ker(A + iI_n)^p$. Then $X^{s+1} u = \sum_{i \geq s} X u_i$ where, by the previous result, $Xu_i \in \bigoplus_{j>i} ker(A + jI_n)^p$. □

Lemma 7. *Let s be a positive integer such that $\lambda - s \notin \sigma(A)$. Then*

$$X^s u = 0 \ \textit{ and } \ Xu \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s-1} ker(A + (i - \lambda)I_n)^p.$$

Proof. We may assume $\lambda = 0$.

- Suppose $X^s u \neq 0$. Let $k \geq s$ be the integer such that $u \in ker(X^{k+1}) \backslash ker(X^k)$. Then $(A + kI_n)^p X^k u = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} P_{k+1}^{(r)} A^r u$ and, by lemma 5,

$$X^k u \in ker(A + kI_n)^p. \tag{15}$$

On the other hand,by lemma 6, $X^s u \in \bigoplus_{i \geq s} ker(A + iI_n)^p = \bigoplus_{i > s} ker(A + iI_n)^p$. In the same way,

$$X^k u = X^{k-s} X^s u \in \bigoplus_{i>k} ker(A + iI_n)^p. \tag{16}$$

By relations (15) and (16), we deduce $X^k u = 0$, that is a contradiction.

- Since $X^s u = 0$, one has $(A + (s-1)I_n)^p \cdots (A + I_n)^p X u = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} P_s^{(r)} A^r u = \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \phi_s^{(r)} X^s A^r u = 0$ where the $\phi_s^{(r)}$ are polynomials in X. □

Notation. Let $A \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. We can write $\sigma(A) = \bigsqcup_{r=1}^{k} B_r$ where the B_r's satisfy:

1. for every $1 \leq r \leq k$, there exists $\lambda_r \in \mathbb{C}, c_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B_r = [\![0, c_r]\!] + \lambda_r$.
2. If $r \neq s$ and $u \in B_r, v \in B_s$, then $u - v \neq 1$.

We consider the ordering of the eigenvalues of A induced by the sequence $B_1, \cdots, B_k$ and the associated Jordan normal form of A: there exists an invertible matrix P such that $P^{-1}AP = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{k} U_r$ where for every r, $\sigma(U_r) = B_r$ and U_r is a Jordan matrix.

Theorem 6. *Let $A \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and X be a nilpotent solution of Equation (10). With the previous notation, $P^{-1}XP = \bigoplus_{s=1}^{k} X_s$, where for every s, X_s is a nilpotent upper triangular matrix that satisfies $X_sU_s - U_sX_s = X_sg(X_s)$.*

Proof. This follows from lemma 6 and lemma 7. □

5.2. **The complete solution.**

Remark. *According to Theorem 6, we have reduced the problem to solve Equation (10) in the case $A = U_s$.*

In the following, we show that if $A = U_s$ then it remains to solve a sequence of Sylvester equations (cf. Equation (12) and Property (13)). Moreover if U_s is diagonalizable, then we obtain an explicit solution that is computable by iteration. First we consider the general case and we may assume that $\sigma(A) = [\![0, k-1]\!]$.

Proposition 2. *Let $A = diag(n_1, I_{s_2} + n_2, \cdots, (k-1)I_{s_k} + n_k)$ where the n_i's are nilpotent matrices of dimensions s_i such that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} s_i = n$. Let $\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_{n-1}$ be complex numbers. The general nilpotent solution of the equation*

$$XA - AX = X + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \alpha_i X^i \tag{17}$$

is a stictly upper triangular $(k \times k)$ block matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$. Let $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Knowing the false block diagonals of X with indices $j < i$, the false block diagonal of X with index i can be obtained by the resolution of $k-i$ similar Sylvester equations.

Proof. By lemma 7, X satisfies $X^k = 0$ and is a strictly upper triangular $(k \times k)$ block matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$. By identification, the false diagonal with index 1 satisfies: for every $j \in [\![1, k-1]\!]$, $x_{j,j+1}n_{j+1} - n_jx_{j,j+1} = 0$. These equations are in the form $\phi(x_{j,j+1}) = 0$ where ϕ is a nilpotent operator. Now the false diagonal with index $i \in [\![2, k-1]\!]$ satisfies: for every $j \in [\![1, k-i]\!]$, $x_{j,j+i}((i-1)I_{s_{j+i}} + n_{j+i}) - n_jx_{j,j+i} = \psi_{ij}$ where ψ_{ij} depends on the false diagonals with indices $[\![1, i-1]\!]$. These equations are in the form $\phi(x_{j,j+i}) = \psi_{ij}$ with $\phi = (i-1)Id + \nu$ where ν is a nilpotent operator. Thus $x_{j,j+i} = (\frac{1}{i-1}Id - \frac{1}{(i-1)^2}\nu + \frac{1}{(i-1)^3}\nu^2 - \cdots)\psi_{ij}$. □

In the case where A is diagonalizable, one has the

Proposition 3. *Let $A = diag(0_{s_1}, I_{s_2} \cdots, (k-1)I_{s_k})$ with $s_1 + \cdots + s_k = n$ and $\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_{n-1}$ be complex numbers. The general nilpotent solution of Equation (17) is a strictly upper triangular $(k \times k)$ block matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$ such that the $x_{i,i+1}$'s are arbitrary $(s_i \times s_{i+1})$ matrices and, for every $r > 1$,*

$$x_{i,i+r} = P_r(\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_r)\, x_{i,i+1}\, x_{i+1,i+2} \, \cdots \, x_{i+r-1,i+r}$$

where P_r is a polynomial in $\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_r$, with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$, that depends only on r.

Proof. By lemma 7, X satisfies $X^k = 0$ and is a strictly upper triangular $(k \times k)$ block matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$. Let $i \in [\![1, k-1]\!]$. We obtain, by identification:

$$\text{for every } r \in [\![1, k-i]\!], (r-1)x_{i,i+r} = \sum_{s=2}^{r} \alpha_s \sum_{i<i_1<\cdots<i_{s-1}<i+r} x_{i,i_1}x_{i_1,i_2}\cdots x_{i_{s-1},i+r}.$$

Thus the $x_{i,i+1}$'s are arbitrary. Moreover $x_{i,i+2} = \alpha_2\,(x_{i,i+1}x_{i+1,i+2})$ or $P_2(\alpha_2) = \alpha_2$. Obviously $x_{i,i+r}$ is expressed as a function of the $x_{j,j+u}$'s with $j \in [\![1, k-1]\!]$ and $1 \leq u < r$. Then, by induction on r, it is easy to show the required formula for $x_{i,i+r}$. □

Example 1. *For instance, one has:*

$$P_3(\alpha_2, \alpha_3) = \alpha_2^2 + \frac{\alpha_3}{2}, P_4(\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) = \alpha_2^3 + \frac{4}{3}\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \frac{\alpha_4}{3},$$

$$P_5(\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_5) = \alpha_2^4 + \frac{29}{12}\alpha_2^2\alpha_3 + \frac{7}{6}\alpha_2\alpha_4 + \frac{3}{8}\alpha_3^3 + \frac{\alpha_5}{5},$$

$$P_6(\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_6) = \alpha_2^5 + \frac{37}{10}\alpha_2^3\alpha_3 + \frac{13}{5}\alpha_2^2\alpha_4 + \frac{8}{5}\alpha_3^2\alpha_2 + \frac{3}{5}\alpha_3\alpha_4 + \frac{11}{10}\alpha_2\alpha_5 + \frac{\alpha_6}{5}.$$

Using Maple, one obtains $(P_i)_{i\leq 13}$ in 1'50".

Remark. *The solution $X = 0$ is always a cluster point of the set of the solutions of Equation (17).*

5.3. **Application to the logarithm function.**

Let A be a $(n \times n)$ complex matrix.

Definition. *Let X be a $(n \times n)$ matrix that has no eigenvalues on $\mathbb{R}^- = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \leq 0\}$. The X-principal logarithm $\log(X)$ is the $(n \times n)$ matrix U such that $e^U = X$ and the eigenvalues of U lie in the strip $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Im(z) \in (-\pi, \pi)\}$.*

Remark. *The function $X \to \log(X)$ is a primary matrix function.*

Proposition 4. *We consider the $(n \times n)$ matrices X that have no eigenvalues on $\mathbb{R}^-$ and that satisfy:*

$$XA - AX = \log(X). \tag{18}$$

The general solution of Equation (18) is $X = I_n + N$ where N is a nilpotent matrix that satisfies $NA - AN = N + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \dfrac{(-1)^{i-1}}{i} N^i$.

Proof. Here $f(X) = \log(X)$, $\alpha = 1$ and $f'(\alpha) = 1$. Then $X = I_n + N$ where N a nilpotent matrix. □

Remark. *If A is diagonalizable, then the values of the polynomials cited in Example 1 are: $P_2 = \dfrac{-1}{2}, P_3 = \dfrac{5}{12}, P_4 = \dfrac{-31}{72}, P_5 = \dfrac{361}{720}, P_6 = \dfrac{-4537}{7200}$.*

6. THE MATRIX EQUATION $f(XA - AX) = X$

Of course $XA - AX = \log(X)$ implies $e^{XA-AX} = X$. But is the converse true ? We consider the equations in the form: $f(XA - AX) = X$.

6.1. **The general case.** Let $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function and Ω be a complex domain containing 0. We note $f(0) = \alpha$.

Proposition 5. *Let X be a $(n \times n)$ matrix such that $f(XA - AX) = X$. There exists a nilpotent matrix N such that $X = \alpha I_n + N$, $NA - AN$ is nilpotent and*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!}(NA - AN)^k = N.$$

Moreover, if $f'(0) \neq 0$, there exist a ball $\mathcal{B}$ containing α and an analytic function g definite on $\mathcal{B}$ such that $g'(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $NA - AN = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \dfrac{g^{(k)}(\alpha)}{k!} N^k$. The $(g^{(k)}(\alpha))_{1 \leq k \leq n-1}$'s are explicitely computable quotients of the $(f^{(k)}(0))_{1 \leq k \leq n-1}$'s.

Proof. The matrix $f(XA - AX)$ is a polynomial in $XA - AX$. Clearly, X and $XA - AX$ commute. Thus, $XA - AX$ is a nilpotent matrix, $\sigma(X) = \{\alpha\}$ and there exists a nilpotent matrix N such that $X = \alpha I_n + N$ and $f(NA - AN) = \alpha I_n + N$. If $f'(0) \neq 0$, then f admits a local inverse g, an analytic function defined on a neighborhood of α and with values in a neighborhood of 0. Consequently,

$$NA - AN = g(\alpha I_n + N).$$

The last assertion is trivial. ☐

Taking $f(z) = e^z$, we deduce the following result:

Corollary 2. *The equations $e^{XA-AX} = X$ and $XA - AX = \log(X)$ have the same solutions.*

Remark. *Since the nilpotent matrix N commute with $NA - AN$, the matrices NA and AN are nilpotent. This result is due to Kostant* [3].

6.2. **The case $f'(0) = 0$.** Now $f'(0) = 0$ and the properties of the solutions of the equation

$$f(XA - AX) = X$$

are very different.

Proposition 6. *Let A be a (3×3) matrix such that A has three pairwise distinct eigenvalues. The equation*

$$(XA - AX)^2 = X \tag{19}$$

admits non zero solutions in $\mathcal{M}_3(\mathbb{C})$.

Proof. Here $f(x) = x^2$ and $\alpha = 0$. By Proposition 5, X is nilpotent. We may assume $A = diag(u, v, w)$. Let $X = [x_{ij}]$ be a solution of Equation (19). Obviously, $X^2 = (XA - AX)^4 = 0$. From the relations $X^2 = 0$ and $(XA - AX)^2 = X$, in a coordinatewise way, using Maple, one obtains all the non zero solutions in the form:

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{1}{(w-u)(u-v)} & q & qr(u-v)(v-w) \\ \dfrac{1}{q(u-v)^2(v-w)(w-u)} & \dfrac{1}{(u-v)(v-w)} & r \\ \dfrac{1}{qr(u-v)^2(v-w)^2(w-u)^2} & \dfrac{1}{r(v-w)^2(w-u)(u-v)} & \dfrac{1}{(v-w)(w-u)} \end{pmatrix}$$

where q, r are non zero arbitrary complex numbers. ☐

Remarks. *i) The matrix 0 is an isolated point of the set of the solutions of Equation (19).*
ii) Let $X \neq 0$. Since X and A have no common eigenvectors, they are not simultaneously triangularizable.
iii) The matrix $XA - AX$ is a square root of X. Hence, to solve Equation (19) is equivalent to solve the equation $Y^2A - AY^2 = Y$ with $X = Y^2$.

6.3. **A mixed equation.** Let f, g be two analytic functions defined on Ω that vanish on 0 only. We show that the equation $f(XA - AX) = g(X)$ may have non nilpotent solutions.

Proposition 7. *Let A be a (2×2) matrix such that A has two distinct eigenvalues. The equation*

$$(XA - AX)^2 = X^2 \tag{20}$$

admits essentially non nilpotent solutions in $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

Proof. We may assume $A = diag(u, v)$. It is easy to show that $\mathrm{Tr}(X) = 0$. Hence X is in the form $X = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix}$, and satisfies the unique relation $a^2 + bc((u-v)^2+1) = 0$. The solution X is nilpotent if and only the supplementary condition $bc = 0$ is fulfilled. ☐

REFERENCES

[1] Dietrich Burde. On the matrix equation $XA - AX = X^p$. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 404:147–165, 2005.

[2] Nicholas J. Higham. *Functions of matrices.* Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2008. Theory and computation.

[3] Bertram Kostant. The principal three-dimensional subgroup and the Betti numbers of a complex simple Lie group. *Amer. J. Math.*, 81:973–1032, 1959.

GÉRALD BOURGEOIS, UNIVERSITÉ DE LA POLYNÉSIE FRANÇAISE, BP 6570, 98702 FAA'A, TAHITI, POLYNÉSIE FRANÇAISE.

E-mail address: `gerald.bourgeois@upf.pf`